

### **REMARKS**

Claims 11-16, 22, 29, and 32 were pending in this application. The Office Action rejected Claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The Office Action also rejected Claims 11-13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Finally, the Office Action objected to Claims 14-16. Applicants have amended Claims 12, 15, 16, and 29. Applicants have cancelled Claims 11, 13, 14, 22, and 32. Accordingly, Claims 12, 15, 16, and 29 are now pending. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Rejection of Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,339 to Thomas et al ("Thomas"). Applicants have amended Claim 29 to more specifically indicate that the method facilitates the conversion of a static device identifier to a global alias identifier so as to allow for transmission of a message to a user that is not associated with the network from which the message originated. Specifically, Applicants amended Claim 29 to recite that "the user alias identifier is used to replace at least one static user device identifier as the intended recipient of a message which was received by a service provider." Hence, the claim recites a method where a message received with a static device identifier as the address which is processed by reference to a translation database to replace the static device identifier with an alias identifier. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection based on this amendment to Claim 29. Specifically, applicants submit that the system of Thomas does not convert a static device identifier to an alias identifier as the recipient of a message but rather receives a dynamic current IP from a remote network and replaces an alias identifier with the remote IP address when communicating with the remote user. Col. 5, ll. 3-17. Hence, Thomas does not disclose replacing a device identifier with an alias for delivering messages to a user but rather the opposite, replacing an alias with a dynamic current transient identity. Col. 4, ll. 35-44. Moreover, Thomas does not disclose a message transmitted with the alias as the recipient identifier as recited by Claim 29. Rather, Thomas discloses transmitting the alias identifier as part of a message body in a message directed to the home gatekeeper, instead of a user associated with the alias. Col. 4, ll. 16-

30. In short, the present invention recited by Claim 29 provides that a service provider employs a database of static device identifiers and alias identifiers to replace an identifier in a recipient field of an outgoing message with an alias identifier corresponding to a static device identifier and then forwards the message to a message system that ensures that the message is delivered to a user device corresponding to the alias in the recipient field. Thomas does not disclose such a system. Rather, Thomas discloses a system where a remote network notifies a local network of the dynamic location of a user so as to allow the home network to directly transmit communication to that user. Accordingly, Claim 29 is allowable over Thomas for at least these reasons alone.

**Objection to Claims 14-16**

The Office Action objected to Claims 14-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but which would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten Claim 12 to include the limitations of Claims 13 and 14. Applicants have rewritten Claim 15 to include the limitations of base Claims 13 and 12. Applicants have rewritten Claim 16 to include the limitations of base Claims 13 and 12. Accordingly, Claims 12, 15, and 16 are in condition for allowance.

**Rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejected Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Although Applicants disagree with the office action that Claims 11-13 are obvious in view of the prior art, Applicants have amended Claim 12, as discussed above, and have canceled Claims 11, and 13.

Application No. 09/610,402  
Amendment dated September 22, 2004  
Responsive to Office Action dated April 7, 2004


**SUMMARY**

In view of the forgoing supporting remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of pending Claims 12, 15, 16, and 29. This application is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

If the Examiner wishes to direct any questions concerning this application to the undersigned Applicants' representative, please call the number indicated below.

Dated: September 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
Guy Perry  
Reg. No. 46,194

Attorney for Applicant  
(212) 735-3000  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP  
Four Times Square  
New York, NY 10036